



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sorious moods he must be aware that, though habitual blundering may be unpardonable, there is no single lapse that a great scholar may not excusably be guilty of, whether his name be Wilamowitz, Gildersleeve, Jebb, Butcher—or Postgate. I am tempted to cite examples from my *marginalia*. But we can all do it, and I forbear.

“Scimus et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.”

PAUL SHOREY

Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens. Von FRANZ POLAND. Priesschriften gekrönt und hrsg. von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Nr. XXIII der historisch-nationalökonomischen Sektion. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. Pp. 655. M. 24.

This imposing work, which may be regarded as an enlargement and completion of Ziebarth's *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, has nine main divisions: (1) “Namen und Arten,” pp. 5–172; (2) “Götterverehrung,” pp. 173–270; (3) “Personenstand,” pp. 271–329; (4) “Organisation,” pp. 330–452; (5) “Finanzen,” pp. 453–98; (6) “Sittlichkeit,” pp. 499–513; (7) “Geschichtlichen Ueberblick,” pp. 514–34; (8) “Listen der benutzten Inschriften und Papyri,” pp. 548–630; (9) “Register,” pp. 630–55. The remainder is made up of a few pages of introduction, and thirteen pages of additions and corrections which were made necessary by the fact that the printing began in 1905.

The author was ill advised in calling his book a history. It has indeed made a history of the Greek private associations possible, but it is itself simply a collection of the materials for such a work. We hasten to add, however, that it is a complete collection; that the materials are well mastered and admirably analyzed, and that so many new, important observations are made that the whole represents a substantial scientific advance.

The term *thiasos* in Attic use meant technically, Poland remarks, a subdivision of a phratry. Hence it could not be the *abstractum* of *orgeones* or of *thiasotai*. Hence too, we may add, lists of members of *thiasoi* were normally published without the *demotica*, which arose from the relatively late, concurrent registration of citizens in the demes. Elsewhere, however, in our judgment, the lack of *demotica* signifies the presence of foreigners; so that the distinction drawn by Poland between *orgeones* and *thiasotai* is not complete. The former were all Athenians, the latter all foreigners—at least till, in the second century B. C., Athens abandoned her inveterate social exclusiveness. The associations designated by titles compounded of the names of deities and the suffix—*stai*, and especially the *eranistai*, were composed according to circumstances

either of citizens or of citizens and foreigners together. Moreover, the chief reason for the prevalence of these new names for associations formed after the end of the third century B. C. is that at this time organizations were needed in which Athenians and aliens could mix. We are thus unable to concur wholly in the view which runs through Poland's entire book, and which he expresses most concisely on p. 380 when he speaks of the development "den das Vereinsleben von dem alten religiösen Orgeonentum durch die Thiasotenvereine zum materiellen Eranistenkolleg hin nahm." In our judgment—and we have considered all of Poland's evidence carefully—the general trend was directly the opposite. The *orgeones* were in the fourth century B. C. primarily relatives. They had long since lost the religious impulse which brought them into being. Membership in one of their associations was then simply a mark of good social standing. Individually they were entitled to registration in the phratries, and beyond doubt there was often a practical identity between their unions and the *thiasoi*. With religion they had only a traditional concern. This, however, was sufficient to warrant gentlemen of Athens who were interested in a foreign deity in forming an association under this name for the gratification of their interest; but they could do so only when the deity had been already accepted by the state. The *orgeones* thus tended to *become* religious. A religious association of foreigners (*thiasotai*) became the center of a religious congregation when the state recognized the cult and appointed a public priest to administer it. The cases of Serapis and Atargatis on Athenian Delos are all that need to be cited here. The line of development was, further, not from the *thiasotai* and *eranistai* to the quasi-public clubs of *technitai*, *athletai*, *epheboi*, *neoi*, *presbyteroi*, *gerontes*, of the Roman era, but to the churches of Isis, Cybele, Dea Syra, Jahwe, Mithra, Christ. Hence it is only by the exclusion of these latter that Poland is justified in making the *Vereinsleben* of the Roman age worldly and material. We think, moreover, that he has minimized too much the protective and funerary purposes of the Hellenistic *koina* of *thiasotai*. Had he used the noteworthy *nomos* published in the *Annual of the British School at Athens* for 1906-7, p. 328, he might have penetrated deeper into the true *raison d'être* of many of these earlier associations. Foucart went too far in reserving the private associations to foreigners. Poland has gone too far in the opposite direction. He has minimized unduly, in our judgment, the part played in them by women and slaves also. These, of course, had no place in the political or semi-political organizations (*thiasoi*, *orgeones*, and the clubs of the Roman age), but in the middle group of *thiasotai* and *eranistai*, as well as in the religious congregations into which these grew, there is distinct evidence for the participation of women of the lower classes and of slaves; and when this is the case with the more important of them, which have alone come to our

knowledge, this sex and element was doubtless largely represented in the great mass of obscure associations of which we know nothing. *Les absents ont toujours tort.*

Poland has enabled us to distinguish the areas of Greek *Vereinsleben* according to nomenclature, locality, and time. He has done for the Hellenistic private associations what Walzing has done for the Roman *collegia*. We need a study like Cumont's *Mithra* and Harnack's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* for each of the oriental cults. Then we may hope for a *Geschichte des antiken Vereinswesens*.

W. S. FERGUSON

Society and Politics in Ancient Rome. By FRANK FROST ABBOTT, Professor of Classics in Princeton University. New York: Scribner, 1909.

The growing tendency on the part of our classical professors to collect fugitive papers into volumes of essays, as well as the increasing frequency of their contributions to the non-professional journals, are interesting and encouraging signs. They show that their work is not confined to the domain of what has been called "austere philology," but deals to some extent with subjects which are of interest to all cultivated readers.

Professor Abbott's volume shows that papers which do not perceptibly advance the frontier of the science at any point, or contain anything that is strikingly novel to the specialist, may yet be read even by the specialist with profit as well as with pleasure. One of the very best of the essays, for example, is the one which in the nature of the case has least new material to offer—the sympathetic sketch of the life of Cicero's son, under the title of "The Career of a Roman Student." To the layman it must be something of a revelation to find how intimately some of the more technical and less familiar branches of classical philology, such as epigraphy and paleography, may be connected with matters of interest to every thoughtful reader.

In these days, when affectation in style is almost as common as it was in the days of the early Roman Empire, one cannot fail to note and to commend Professor Abbott's smooth and graceful diction. One's attention is rarely caught by brilliant or would-be brilliant *sententiae* (although the reference to Clodius as the stormy petrel of politics seems distinctly in the former class), nor is one's easy course checked by rough places in the road. The latter are the more noticeable because of their rarity. The opening sentence of the essay on "The Theatre as a Factor in Roman Politics under the Republic" must be read twice before one realizes that the comma in the second line belongs at the end of the first. The only other typographical error that has been noted is the loss of a period at the end of the second sentence on p. 162. At the bottom